

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Uri Reisman,

Plaintiff,

v.

University of South Carolina; Sonya
Singleton; Mary Grace Strickland,

Defendants.

C/A No. 3:24-cv-2451-SAL-PJG

ORDER

Plaintiff Uri Reisman filed this action in the Richland County Court of Common Pleas on March 19, 2024, alleging causes of action for defamation, breach of contract, tortious interference with contractual relations and prospective contractual relations, and violations of Title IX. *See* Compl., ECF No. 1-1. After the defendants removed the action to this court, defendant Mary Grace Strickland filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim on May 1, 2024. ECF No. 6. This matter is before the court on the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), recommending Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss be denied. ECF No. 24. Neither party filed objections to the Report, and the time for doing so has expired.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the

Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After reviewing the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standard, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, ECF No. 24, and incorporates it by reference herein. As a result, defendant Strickland’s motion to dismiss, ECF No. 6, is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

September 26, 2024
Columbia, South Carolina


Sherri A. Lydon
United States District Judge